

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 18, 2003 in which Claims 13-20 were withdrawn from consideration and in which Claims 1-12 and 21-27 were rejected. With this Reply, Claims 13-20 are cancelled; Claims 1, 7, 12, 21 and 22 are amended; and Claims 28-37 are added. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-12 and 21-37 are requested.

I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On October 9, 2003, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Prone and Applicant's attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The objection to the drawings set forth in paragraph 3 and the objection to the specification set forth in paragraph 5 of the Office Action were discussed. In addition, the rejections set forth in paragraph 7 of the Office Action was also discussed. It was tentatively agreed upon that the objection to the drawings under paragraph 3 would be withdrawn such that corrected drawings are no longer required. Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Prone for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for the Examiner's suggestions for overcoming such objections and rejections.

II. Withdrawal of Claims 13-20.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action indicated that Claims 13-20 were withdrawn "as being drawn to a non-elected species." Claims 13-20 are cancelled. Applicant respectfully notes that Claims 13-20 were actually withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention, not a non-elected species.

III. Objection to the Drawings.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action objected to the drawings as failing to include reference signs. Applicant respectfully notes that items "P1", "C", "C1", "C2", "C3", "C4", "T", "T1", "T2", "T3", "T4" are not reference signs, but are merely labels utilizing the specification for distinguishing different signs (T1, T2, T3, T4) for distinguishing different signals (C1, C2, C3, C4, P1). As signals are points in time, they cannot be shown in the

drawings. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings set forth in paragraph 3 be withdrawn.

IV. Objection to the Disclosure.

Paragraph 4 objected to the disclosure suggesting that the phrase “fluid-flow lines 156 and 158” be replaced with “fluid-flow lines 154 and 156”. The disclosure is amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action requests that any trademarks in the specification be capitalized and accompanied by generic terminology. In response, the application is amended as suggested by the Examiner. In particular, paragraph 22 is amended to capitalize the trademark PARALLEL GRIPPER. The remaining trademarks set forth in the disclosure are capitalized and are accompanied by generic terminology. For example, paragraph 19 capitalized the trademark POSIJET is accompanied by generic technology (printer). Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 1-12, 21-23, 26 and 27 Based Upon Blessing et al.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-12, 21-23, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Blessing et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,951,400. Independent Claims 1, 12 and 21, as amended, overcome the rejection and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

A. Claims 1-12

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites a tool including a tear-off edge and a conveyor adapted to selectively move the grasper to move the tearable medium against the tear-off edge to sever the tearable medium. Independent Claim 12 recites a tool also having a tear-off edge and having a conveyor which moves first and second jaws to move the tearable medium when grasped by the first and second jaws against the tear-off edge.

Blessing et al. fails to disclose a tool having a tear-off edge, a grasper adapted to selectively grasp a tearable medium and a conveyor which moves the grasper or jaws so as to

move the tearable medium against the tear-off edge to sever the tearable medium. In contrast, Blessing et al. merely discloses a cloth mover and stacker which moves pre-cut strips of cloth 12 from a working surface 14 into a tote box 16. The cloth mover and stacker does not include a tear-off edge. Moreover, the pneumatic cylinder 62 of Blessing et al. does not move curved member 58 and clamping lever 60 so as to move a tearable medium against the tear-off edge. Because the device disclosed by Blessing et al. is provided for simply moving pre-cut strips of cloth 12 from a working surface into a tote box, it would not be obvious to modify the cloth mover and stacker of Blessing et al. to include a tear-off edge. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 12, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Blessing et al. Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 21

Independent Claim 21, as amended, recites the tool for tearing printable medium from an imaging device. The tool includes a conveyor, an actuator attached to the conveyor and including a slide, a first jaw attached to the actuator and a second jaw slidably attached to the slide of the actuator so as to linearly move towards and away from the first jaw.

Blessing et al. fails to disclose such a tool. In particular, Blessing et al. fails to disclose a first jaw attached to an actuator on a conveyor and a second jaw slidably attached to a slide of the actuator so as to linearly move towards and away from the first jaw. In contrast, Blessing et al. discloses clamping lever 60 that pivots. Clamping lever 60 does not linearly move towards and away from curved end 58. Accordingly, independent Claim 21, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Blessing et al. Claims 22-27 depend from Claim 21 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

C. Claim 27

Claim 27 depends from Claim 21 and recites that the slide of the actuator is oriented at an angle with respect to the conveyor. Blessing et al. fails to disclose an actuator slide that is oriented at an angle with respect to the conveyor. The Office Action characterizes extension rod 64 of pneumatic cylinder 62 as a slide. The Office Action further characterizes pneumatic cylinder 62 of Blessing et al. as a conveyor. However, extension rod 64 does not

extend at an angle with respect to pneumatic cylinder 62. Furthermore, it would not be obvious to modify extension rod 64 so as to extend at an angle with respect to cylinder 62 since such would destroy the intended operation of the pneumatic cylinder assembly disclosed by Blessing et al. Accordingly, Claim 27 overcomes the rejection based upon Blessing et al. for this additional reason.

VI. Rejection of Claims 24 and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon Blessing et al. and Miller.

Paragraph 9 of the Office Action rejected Claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Blessing et al. in view of Miller, U.S. Patent No. 6,590,387. Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 21 and overcome the rejection based upon Blessing et al. in view of Miller for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. In addition, Applicant respectfully notes that neither Claim 24 nor Claim 25 requires that the electromechanical valve be electrically connected to the conveyor and to the actuator. In contrast, Claim 24 recites that the electromechanical valve is electrically connected to the controller and fluidly connected to the conveyor. Claim 25 recites that the electromechanical valve is electrically connected to the controller and fluidly connected to the actuator.

VII. Added Claims.

With this Reply, Claims 28-37 are added. Claim 28 depends from Claim 21 and recites that the tear-off edge extends along an axis oblique to the axis along which the conveyor moves. Added Claim 29 depends from Claim 12 and recites that the tear-off edge extends along a third axis oblique to the axis along which the conveyor moves. The prior art of record fails to disclose such a tear-off edge that extends along an axis oblique to an axis along which a conveyor moves. Accordingly, Claims 28 and 29 are presented for consideration and allowance.

Added Claim 30 recites a printing system. The printing system includes a printer configured to print upon a tearable medium, an edge configured to extend along the tearable medium and a grasper configured to grasp the tearable medium while being moved to urge the tearable medium against the edge to sever the medium. The prior art of record fails to

disclose such a printing system. Applicant notes that the recited “edge” in all of the claims (originally filed and added) may in some embodiments be so sharp so as to serve as a blade, while in other embodiments, the edge may be dull. Applicant further notes that in all the claims the term “grasper” refers to a device which grasps the tearable medium either by engaging the tearable medium on opposite sides of the tearable medium or by being releasably adhered to a single side of the tearable medium. Added Claims 31-37 depend from Claim 30 and are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record for the same reasons. Added Claims 31-37 recite additional features which further patentably distinguish such claims over the prior art of record.

VIII. Conclusion.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 5, 2003

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER
777 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 3800
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-5306
Telephone: (414) 297-5710
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276